



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,536	10/06/2000	Kamran R. Khadavi	DR-224 (50564)	1536
7590	08/23/2005			
RICHARD K. WARTHER				EXAMINER
Allen, Dyer, Doppelt, Milbrath & Gilchrist, P.A. 255 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1401 P.O. Box 3791 Orlando, FL 32802-3791				MOORE, IAN N
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2661	
DATE MAILED: 08/23/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/684,536	KHADAVI, KAMRAN R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ian N. Moore	2661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-23,26-34 and 37-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 22,23,26-34,37-43,45 and 46 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,5-7,11-13,15-17,21,44 and 47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 8-10 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10-6-2000.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1, 12, 44 and 47 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Claim 1 recites, “comparing the results of local loop testing to thresholds” in line 6-7. It is unclear how one can possibly obtain the testing result without actually performing the testing. The claim does not recite the local loop “testing” method/process that is critical/essential to the practice of the invention, yet the testing result is being compared.

Claims 12, 44, and 47 are also objected for the same reason as stated above in claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12,13,15-17, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amrany et al (US 6,192,109) in view of Cook (US 5,623,543).

With respect to claim 1, Amrany et al discloses a method and apparatus for improved DSL communication. To determine the maximum permissible transmit signal power, Amrany et al sends a single- or multi- tone test signal or any other signal compatible with xDSL

(determining the physical loop faults) (column 3, lines 20-25). In response to a detected line condition, the xDSL communication is transmitted at the highest data rate supported by the transmission line (qualifying the local loop I calculating the data rates of the local loop) (column 3, lines 46-48). Amrany et al further discloses the monitoring of the signal-to-noise ratio (quantifying the local loop by calculating the signal-to-noise ratio) (column 8, lines 63-65).

Although well known in the art, Amrany et al does not expressly disclose the modeling of the local loop. Cook discloses an expression for determining the characteristic impedance of a transmission line such as POTS (column 1, lines 40-47).

A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Cook in Amrany et al to determine the impedance of transmission line. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Amrany et al with Cook (collectively Amrany-Cook) so as to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

With respect to claims 2 and 3, Amrany et al patent is for use with xDSL technologies that include symmetric- and asymmetric- DSL.

With respect to claims 5 and 15, Amrany discloses that the characteristic impedance of the transmission line is a function of resistance, inductance, shunt conductance and capacitance per unit length (RLGC) of the line (column 1, lines 40-47).

With respect to claims 6 and 16, Amrany discloses that the characteristic impedance of the transmission line is also a function of angular frequency (frequency) (column 1, lines 40-47).

With regard to claim 7 and 17, Amrany et al sends a single- or multi- tone test signal or any other signal compatible with xDSL (column 3, lines 20-25). The sending device reads on

applicant's test head. In response to a detected line condition (plant data and test results), the xDSL communication is transmitted at the highest data rate supported by the transmission line (column 3, lines 46-48).

With respect to claim 12, Amrany et al discloses a method and apparatus for improved DSL communication. To determine the maximum permissible transmit signal power, Amrany et al sends a single- or multi- tone test signal or any other signal compatible with xDSL (determining the physical loop faults) (column 3, lines 20-25). In response to a detected line condition, the xDSL communication is transmitted at the highest data rate supported by the transmission line (qualifying the local loop/calculating the data rates of the local loop) (column 3, lines 46-48). Amrany et al further discloses the monitoring of signal spectral characteristics of the test signal (quantifying the local loop by calculating the PSD) (column 8, lines 40-44).

Although well known in the art, Amrany et al does not expressly disclose the modeling of the local loop. Cook discloses an expression for determining the characteristic impedance of a transmission line such as POTS (column 1, lines 40-47). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Cook in Amrany et al to determine the impedance of transmission line. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Amrany et al with Cook (collectively Amrany-Cook) so as to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

With respect to claim 13, the Amrany et al patent is for use with xDSL technologies that includes asymmetric- DSL.

With respect to claim 44, Amrany et al discloses a method and apparatus for improved DSL communication. To determine the maximum permissible transmit signal power, Amrany et

Art Unit: 2661

al sends a single- or multi- tone test signal or any other signal compatible with xDSL (determining the physical loop faults) (column 3, lines 20-25). The sending device reads on applicant's test head. In response to a detected line condition (plant data and test results), the xDSL communication is transmitted at the highest data rate supported by the transmission line (qualifying the local loop / calculating the data rates of the local loop) (column 3, lines 46-48). Amrany et al further discloses the monitoring of the signal-to-noise ratio (quantifying the local loop by calculating the signal-to-noise ratio) (column 8, lines 63-65).

Although well known in the art, Amrany et al does not expressly disclose the modeling of the local loop. Cook discloses an expression for determining the characteristic impedance of a transmission line such as POTS (column 1, lines 40-47). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Cook in Amrany et al to determine the impedance of transmission line.

At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Amrany et al with Cook (collectively Amrany-Cook) so as to obtain the invention as specified in claim 44.

4. Claims 11, 21 and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Amrany-Cook in view of Nimmagadda US Patent (6,426,961).

With respect to claims 11, 21, and 47, Amrany et al discloses a method and apparatus for improved DSL communication, To determine the maximum permissible transmit signal power, Amrany et al sends a single- or multi- tone test signal or any other signal compatible with xDSL (determining the physical loop faults) (column 3, lines 20-25). In response to a detected

line condition, the xDSL communication is transmitted at the highest data rate supported by the transmission line (qualifying the local loop / calculating the data rates of the local loop) (column 3, lines 46-48). Amrany et al further discloses the monitoring of the signal-to-noise ratio (quantifying the local loop by calculating the signal-to-noise ratio) (column 8, lines 63-65). Amrany et al further discloses the monitoring of signal spectral characteristics (PSD) of the test signal (column 8, lines 40-44).

Although well known in the art, Amrany et al does not expressly disclose the modeling of the local loop. Cook discloses an expression for determining the characteristic impedance of a transmission line such as POTS (column 1, lines 40-47). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Cook in Amrany et al to determine the impedance of transmission line. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains to combine Amrany et al with Cook (collectively Amrany-Cook). Amrany-Cook, however, does not disclose the selection of a DSL technology from a configurable list. Nimmagadda discloses a method for the selection of a communication technology. As shown in Fig 3, after the performance information is determined, a subscriber may evaluate the information and select the most appropriate mode of operation. The appropriate mode is selected from a list (configurable list) (column 3, lines 9-25). A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ Nimmagadda with Amrany-Cook so as to select an appropriate DSL technology so as to limit bandwidth. At the time the invention was made, therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a list from which the most appropriate DSL technology may be chosen so as to obtain the invention as specified in claims 11, 21 and 47.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 22,23,26-34,37-43,45 and 46 are allowed.
6. Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 2/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claims 1,12,44 and 47, the applicant argued that, “...nowhere does Amrany, Cook or Nimmagadda discloses either singularly or combination the qualifying of the local loop by comparing the results of local loop testing with the thresholds specified by given DSL technologies” in page 13, paragraph 5; page 14, paragraph 1-3; and page 15, paragraph 1.

In response to applicant's argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument above.

Amrany discloses the qualifying of the local loop by comparing the results of local loop testing (see col. 3, line 20-26; see col. 8, line 35-50; return test signal) with the thresholds (see col. 3, line 26-30; see col. 8, line 51-65; comparing with predetermined level/value/thresholds (i.e. distortion, inter-modulation products)) specified by given DSL technologies (see col. 3, line 15-22, 45-55; see col. 6, line 38-50; xDSL, which includes any “x” technologies of DSL (i.e. ADSL, SDSL, HDSL, etc.)).

Art Unit: 2661

The applicant argued that, “...Amrany does not discloses any modeling of the local loop...” in page 15, paragraph 1.

In response to applicant's argument, the examiner respectfully disagrees with the argument above.

As clearly disclosed by the previous office action, modeling/setting/configuring a local loop is well known in the art and standards. Every xDSL and/or POTS line/circuit involves modeling/setting/configuring digital local carrier (DLC) loop (see cited GR-303-CORE). Amrany discuss the spectrum allocation for ADSL signal with respect to signal power (i.e. requirement/setting for a ADSL), in FIG. 1, see col. 4, line 59-65. Cook discloses modeling of the local loop (see col. 1, line 10-25, 40-47; determining the characteristic of a transmission line (i.e. ADSL/POTS)). Thus, the combine system discloses the argued limitations.

In view of the above, **the examiner respectfully disagrees** with applicant's argument and believes that the combination of references as set forth in the 103 rejections is proper at least the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2661

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ian N. Moore whose telephone number is 571-272-3085. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM- 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chau Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-3126. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



INM
JNM
8/18/05

CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600